EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YO		
ARTEM GALYNKIN,	X	Case No.:
	Plaintiff,	NOTICE OF REMOVAL
- against -		
PEDRO PENA and WALL EXPRES	SS, INC.,	
	Defendants.	
	·/1	

INITED OF ATEC DISTRICT COLIRT

TO THE CLERK OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Defendants PEDRO PENA and WALL EXPRESS, INC., through their attorneys TRAUB LIEBERMAN STRAUS & SHREWSBERRY LLP, give notice that the above-captioned action, filed with the Supreme Court for the State of New York, County of Kings (corresponding with index number 508494/2022) and all claims and causes of action therein (the "State Action"), is removed to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York. Defendants grounds for removal are as follows:

GROUNDS FOR REMOVAL

- 1. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1332(a), this Court has original jurisdiction over "the State Action" under based on diversity jurisdiction, and removal is proper pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §§1441 and 1446.
- 2. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1441(a), venue is proper because this Court constitutes the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place where "the State Action" is pending.

Procedural History and Timeliness of Removal

- 3. On March 18, 2022, Plaintiff, Artem Galynkin filed "the State Action" against the Defendants, Pedro Pena and Wall Express, Inc.
- 4. Plaintiff served the Summons and Complaint from "the State Action" on Defendant Wall Express, Inc. on March 30, 2021. Plaintiff served the Summons and Verified Complaint from "the State Action" on Defendant Pedro Pena on March 31, 2021.
 - 5. Plaintiff filed the affidavits of service on the Defendants on April 21, 2022.
- 6. A copy of the Summons and Complaint with the Service of Process Transmittal by the Secretary of State is attached as Exhibit A in accordance with 28 U.S.C. §1446(a).
 - 7. Accordingly, this Notice of Removal is timely.
 - 8. No other motions or proceedings are pending in the State Action.
 - 9. No previous application relief requested herein has been made.
- 10. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1446(d), promptly after this notice of removal is filed, Defendants will give written notice to all adverse parties and will electronically file a copy of this Notice of Removal in "the State Action" through NYSCEF.

Removal is Proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332 and 1441

- 11. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. §1332(a) this Court has original jurisdiction over any matter where "the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000" and the matter is between the "citizens of different States and in which citizens or subjections of a foreign state are additional parties."
- 12. As for 28 U.S.C. §1441(a), "any civil action brought in a State court of which the district courts of the United States have original jurisdiction, may be removed by the defendant or the defendants."

- 13. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1332 because there is complete diversity among the parties, given that Plaintiff is a New York resident and the Defendants are Pennsylvania residents. Complete diversity existed when Plaintiff filed the Summons and Verified Complaint in the State Action and complete diversity exists at the time of the filing of this removal petition. As such, removal to this Court is justified and appropriate.
- 14. Plaintiff's Verified Complaint alleges that Artem Galynkin is a citizen of the County of Kings, State of New York. As evidence in the affidavits of service, Defendant Pedro is a citizen of the State of the Pennsylvania and Defendant Wall Express, Inc. is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania and is a citizen of the State of Pennsylvania. See Exhibit A, page 1 and pages 9 through 10.
- Defendants. Plaintiff Adriana claims to have sustained "serious personal injuries as defined in Section §5102(d) of the Insurance Law of the State of New York; and sustained and/or will sustained non-economic loss as defined in Section §5102(c) of the Insurance Law of the State of New York." See Exhibit A, page 5, paragraph 13.
- 16. Furthermore, Plaintiff claims as follows: "the amount of damages sought in this action exceeds the jurisdictional limits of all lower courts that would otherwise have jurisdiction." See Exhibit A, page 5, paragraph 15.
- 17. As this Court is aware, the basic economic loss as defined by Section §5102 of the Insurance Law of the State of New York is \$50,000. Accordingly, it is a logical and reasonable conclusion that Plaintiff is asserting a claim that exceeds \$75,000 based upon the allegations contained in the Verified Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Defendants respectfully submit it is proper to remove the State Action is from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Queens to the United States District Court in the Eastern District of New York.

Dated: Hawthorne, New York May 13, 2022

TRAUB LIEBERMAN STRAUS & SHREWSBERRY LLP

Attorneys for Defendants Pedro Pena and Wall Express, Inc.

By: Lisa M. Rolle

Lisa M. Rolle, Esq. Mid-Westchester Executive Park Seven Skyline Drive Hawthorne, New York 10532 (914) 347-2600

TO:

IRINA P. VAIMAN, P.C.

Attorneys for Plaintiff Artem Galynkin 1322 Gravesend Neck Road Brooklyn, New York 11229 (718) 743-6611

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

	CKCL SHOOL. (DEE MATROCTTONS OF THE		DEFENDAN	VTC		
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDAN	115		
ARTEM GALYN	KIN		PEDRO PE	ENA an	d WALL EXPRESS	S, INC.
(b) County of Residence of	First Listed Plaintiff KINGS		County of Reside	dence of F	irst Listed Defendant	EHIGH
	CEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			(1)	IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES O EMNATION CASES, USE TI	INLY)
			NOTE: IN LAN THE TR	RACT OF	LAND INVOLVED.	HE LOCATION OF
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A	ddress, and Telephone Number)		Attorneys (If Kno			
	N, P.C., 1322 Gravesend Neck Rd,				IAN STRAUS & SH	IREWSBERRY, LLP
	229 (718) 743-6611	<u> </u>	7 Skyline D		CIDAL DADTIES	
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. Ci	TIZENSHIP OF (For Diversity Cases C		NCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)
1 U.S. Government	3 Federal Question			PTF	DEF	PTF DEF
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citiz	en of This State	LJ I	I Incorporated or Pr of Business In 7	
_		Citie	zen of Another State	[X] 2	X 2 Incorporated and	Principal Place 5 5
2 U.S. Government Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		zen of Another State	(£1) 2	of Business In	
Does this action include a mo to show cause? Yes No	tion for temporary restraining order or order		zen or Subject of a oreign Country	□ 3	3 Foreign Nation	6 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	4	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
CONTRACT	TORTS	F	ORFEITURE/PENAL	LŢY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJUR		25 Drug Related Seizur	1)	422 Appeal 28 USC 158	375 False Claims Act 376 Qui Tam (31 USC
120 Marine	310 Airplane 365 Personal Injury - 315 Airplane Product Product Liability		of Property 21 USC 90 Other	. 881	423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	3729(a))
130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument	3.15 Airplane Product Product Liability Liability 367 Health Care/	F,°	.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			400 State Reapportionment
150 Recovery of Overpayment	320 Assault, Libel & Pharmaceutical				PROPERTY RIGHTS	410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking
& Enforcement of Judgment				-	820 Copyrights 830 Patent	450 Commerce
151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted	330 Federal Employers' Product Liability Liability 368 Asbestos Persona				835 Patent - Abbreviated	460 Deportation
Student Loans	340 Marine Injury Product				New Drug Application 840 Trademark	470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations
(Excludes Veterans)	345 Marine Product Liability	DTV -	LABOR	X2.655.55.1	880 Defend Trade Secrets	480 Consumer Credit
of Veteran's Benefits	Liability PERSONAL PROPER 350 Motor Vehicle 370 Other Fraud		710 Fair Labor Standard	ds	Act of 2016	(15 USC 1681 or 1692)
160 Stockholders' Suits	355 Motor Vehicle 371 Truth in Lending	<i>y</i>	Act			485 Telephone Consumer
190 Other Contract	Product Liability 380 Other Personal		720 Labor/Management	t 📙	SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff)	Protection Act 490 Cable/Sat TV
195 Contract Product Liability	360 Other Personal Property Damage		Relations 740 Railway Labor Act	,	861 HIA (139311) 862 Black Lung (923)	850 Securities/Commodities/
196 Franchise	Injury 385 Property Damage 362 Personal Injury - Product Liability		751 Family and Medical		863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)	
	Medical Malpractice		Leave Act		864 SSID Title XVI	890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITIO		790 Other Labor Litigat 791 Employee Retireme] 865 RSI (405(g))	893 Environmental Matters
210 Land Condemnation	440 Other Civil Rights Habeas Corpus: 441 Voting 463 Alien Detainee		Income Security Ac	-	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	895 Freedom of Information
220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	442 Employment 510 Motions to Vaca	ite	•		870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	Act
240 Torts to Land	443 Housing/ Sentence			-	or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party	896 Arbitration 899 Administrative Procedure
245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations 530 General 445 Amer, w/Disabilities - 535 Death Penalty	138	IMMIGRATION	Jacobarone -	26 USC 7609	Act/Review or Appeal of
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities - 535 Death Penalty Employment Other:	H	462 Naturalization App			Agency Decision
	446 Amer. w/Disabilities - 540 Mandamus & Ot		465 Other Immigration			950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
	Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition	.	Actions			State Statutes
	448 Education 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee -					
	Conditions of					
V. ODIOWY	Confinement			<u></u>		
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X"	emoved from 3 Remanded from	□4 Re	instated or 5 7	Transferre	ed from 6 Multidis	trict
	ate Court Appellate Court		opened /	Another [(specify)		
	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you	are filing	(Do not cite jurisdictio	ional statut	es unless diversity):	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON 28 U.S.C. 1332					
VI. CAUSE OF MOTE	Brief description of cause: Removing from State Court to Federal Court	based on	Diversity			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.	NC	DEMAND \$		CHECK YES onl JURY DEMANI	ly if demanded in complaint: D: Yes No
VIII. RELATED CAS	SE(S)				•	
IF ANY	(See instructions): JUDGE				DOCKET NUMBER _	
DATE	_SIGNATURE OF A	TORNE,	Y OF RECORD			,
May 13, 2022	hisek	ML				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY						
	AMOUNT APPLYING IFI	P	JU	JDGE	MAG. J	UDGE

Case 1:22-cv-02022 Thocareon OF Filest PR/ADVON PROPERTY Page ID #: 12

Local Arbitration Rule 83.7 provides that with certain exceptions, actions seeking money damages only in an amount not in excess of \$150,000, exclusive of interest and costs, are eligible for compulsory arbitration. The amount of damages is presumed to be below the threshold amount unless a certification to the contrary is filed. Case is Eligible for Arbitration Lisa M. Rolle , do hereby certify that the above captioned civil action is ineligible for counsel for compulsory arbitration for the following reason(s): monetary damages sought are in excess of \$150,000, exclusive of interest and costs, the complaint seeks injunctive relief, the matter is otherwise ineligible for the following reason **DISCLOSURE STATEMENT - FEDERAL RULES CIVIL PROCEDURE 7.1** Identify any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation that owns 10% or more or its stocks: RELATED CASE STATEMENT (Section VIII on the Front of this Form) Please list all cases that are arguably related pursuant to Division of Business Rule 50.3.1 in Section VIII on the front of this form. Rule 50.3.1 (a) provides that "A civil case is "related" to another civil case for purposes of this guideline when, because of the similarity of facts and legal issues or because the cases arise from the same transactions or events, a substantial saving of judicial resources is likely to result from assigning both cases to the same judge and magistrate judge." Rule 50.3.1 (b) provides that " A civil case shall not be deemed "related" to another civil case merely because the civil case: (A) involves identical legal issues, or (B) involves the same parties." Rule 50.3.1 (c) further provides that "Presumptively, and subject to the power of a judge to determine otherwise pursuant to paragraph (d), civil cases shall not be deemed to be "related" unless both cases are still pending before the court." NY-E DIVISION OF BUSINESS RULE 50.1(d)(2) Is the civil action being filed in the Eastern District removed from a New York State Court located in Nassau or Suffolk 1.) County? Yes Nο 2.) If you answered "no" above: a) Did the events or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in Nassau or Suffolk County? Yes b) Did the events or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in the Eastern District? Ø Yes No c) If this is a Fair Debt Collection Practice Act case, specify the County in which the offending communication was If your answer to question 2 (b) is "No," does the defendant (or a majority of the defendants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or Suffolk County, or, in an interpleader action, does the claimant (or a majority of the claimants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or No Suffolk County? Yes (Note: A corporation shall be considered a resident of the County in which it has the most significant contacts). BAR ADMISSION I am currently admitted in the Eastern District of New York and currently a member in good standing of the bar of this court. No Are you currently the subject of any disciplinary action (s) in this or any other state or federal court? (If yes, please explain No Yes I certify the accuracy of all information provided above. Signature: Jisa Rolle

EXHIBIT "A"

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 1

SUPREME	COURT O	F THE	STATE	OF	NEW	YORK
COUNTY (OF KINGS					

----X Index No.:

ARTEM GALYNKIN,

Filed:

Plaintiff(s),

Plaintiff designates

Kings County

as the place of trial

SUMMONS

PEDRO PENA and WALL EXPRESS, INC.,

-against-

The basis venue is

Place of the Plaintiff residents

Plaintiff resides at:

8700 25th Avenue Apt 2C Brooklyn, New York 11214

Defendant(s).

TO THE ABOVE-NAMED DEFENDANT:

YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED to answer the Complaint in this action and to serve a copy of your Answer on the plaintiff's attorney within 20 days after the service of this Summons is complete, exclusive of the day of service, or within 30 days after the service of this Summons is complete if this Summons is not personally delivered to you within the State of New York.

In case of your failure to answer this Summons, a judgment will be taken against you by

default for the relief demanded in the Complaint, together with the costs of this action.

Dated: Brooklyn, New York March 18th, 2022

> Irina P. Vaiman, P.C. Attorney for Plaintiff(s) ARTEM GALYNKIN 1322 Gravesend Neck Road

Brooklyn, NY 11229

(718) 743-6611

TO:

Pedro Pena

2834 Alton Avenue

Allentown, PA 18103

Wall Express, Inc. 545 N Centre Street Pottsville, PA 17901 FILED: KINGS 1COUNTY SLERK 03/23/2022 03:46 PM age 9 of RECEASE QUITE 03/23/2022

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF KINGS	X	Index:
ARTEM GALYNKIN,		Filed:
Plaintiff,		
-against-		VERIFIED COMPLAINT
C		
PEDRO PENA and WALL EXPRESS, INC.,		
Defendants	X	
Plaintiff(s), by his attorney, IRINA P. VAIMAN, I	ESQ., coi	mplaining of the defendant(s)
respectfully sets forth and alleges upon information and	belief, as	follows:

- 1. That at all times hereinafter mentioned, plaintiff, ARTEM GALYNKIN, was and still is a resident of the State of New York, County of Kings.
- 2. That at all times hereinafter mentioned, defendant, PEDRO PENA, was and still is a resident of the State of Pennsylvania, County of Lehigh.
- 3. That at the time and place hereinafter mentioned plaintiff, ARTEM GALYNKIN was the owner and operator in charge and control of the motor vehicle bearing New York State license plate number DWE2584.
- 4. That at the time and place hereinafter mentioned defendant, PEDRO PENA was the operator in charge and in control of the motor vehicle bearing Pennsylvania State license plate number PT897K4, with full knowledge and permission of its owner.
- 5. That at the time and place hereinafter mentioned defendant, WALL EXPRESS, INC., was the owner of the motor vehicle bearing Pennsylvania State license plate number PT897K4.

- 6. That at all times hereinafter mentioned, on Metropolitan Avenue, at or near its intersection with Woodward Avenue, in the County of Queens, which was and still is a public street, road and/or thoroughfare in the State of New York.
- 7. That on the 23rd Day of November 2020, plaintiff, ARTEM GALYNKIN, was operating the motor vehicle bearing New York State license plate number DWE2584, on Metropolitan Avenue, at or near its intersection with Woodward Avenue, in the County of Queens.
- 8. That on the 23rd Day of November 2020, defendant, PEDRO PENA, was operating the motor vehicles bearing Pennsylvania State license plate number PT897K4, on Metropolitan Avenue, at or near its intersection with Woodward Avenue, in the County of Queens.
- 9. That on the 23rd Day of November 2020, at approximately 9:57 a. m. o'clock of that day, the aforementioned motor vehicle operated by defendant, PEDRO PENA, collided into the motor vehicle operated by plaintiff, ARTEM GALYNKIN, and caused a collision.
- 10. That heretofore on the 23rd Day of November 2020, at approximately 9:57 a. m. o'clock of that day, the aforesaid motor vehicle of the defendant(s) were so negligently and carelessly owned, operated, managed, supervised, and controlled, so as to cause said motor vehicle to suddenly, and without any notice, signal or warning, strike and collide with the motor vehicle occupied by the plaintiff(s), thereby causing plaintiff(s) to sustain the severe, serious, and, upon information and belief, permanent personal injuries and damages hereafter to be more specifically set forth.

FILED: KINGS: COUNTE: 26LERKun03/23/2023 09/33/25 PMge 11 of 27 PageID #: 17
NYSCEF DOC. NO. 1 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 03/23/2022

- 11. That the aforesaid occurrence and the injuries and damages resulting therefrom to plaintiff(s) were caused wholly and solely by reason of the negligence and carelessness of the defendant(s), and without any negligence on the part of the plaintiff(s) contributing thereto.
- 12. That the aforesaid occurrence and the injuries and damages resulting therefrom to plaintiff(s) were caused wholly and solely by reason of the negligence and carelessness of the defendant(s), in failing and omitting to have and to maintain the said motor vehicle under reasonable and proper control, and in mismanaging the same; in operating the said motor vehicle at a high, dangerous, reckless, unsafe and/or unlawful rate of speed under the traffic and road conditions then and there prevailing; in failing and omitting to keep a safe and proper distance away from motor vehicle occupied by the plaintiff(s); in failing and omitting to apply the brakes to the said motor vehicle in sufficient time in order to have avoided the accident herein complained of; in failing and omitting to give any notice, signal or warning of the approach of the said motor vehicle; in failing and omitting to give the motor vehicle occupied by the plaintiff(s) the right of way; in failing and omitting to observe the motor vehicle occupied by the plaintiff(s) upon the highway in sufficient time so that in the reasonable and proper management and control of the said motor vehicle, the defendant(s) could have avoided the accident herein complained of; in failing and omitting to observe and/or obey the traffic signs and/or signals then and there prevailing; in failing and omitting to keep a proper lookout; in failing and omitting to have safe and adequate brakes and braking mechanisms on the said motor vehicle; in following the motor vehicle of the plaintiff(s) too closely; in violating the laws, statutes, rules, regulations, and ordinances pertaining to motor vehicles and motor vehicle traffic in the City and the State of New York, including but not limited to Section 1129 of the Vehicle and Traffic Laws; in failing and omitting to exercise that degree of care, caution and

Page 12 of 27 Page Dy#cd 03/23/2022

diligence with respect to the ownership, operation, maintenance, supervision, repair and control

of the said motor vehicle, as would be just, reasonable and proper in order to have prevented

the accident herein complained of.

That solely as a result of the foregoing, plaintiff, ARTEM GALYNKIN, 13.

sustained "serious personal injuries" as defined in Section 5102(d) of the Insurance Law of the

State of New York; and sustained and/or will sustain non-economic loss as defined in Section

5102(c) of the Insurance Law of the State of New York.

That solely as a result of the foregoing, plaintiff, ARTEM GALYNKIN, was 14.

caused to sustain severe, serious and, upon information and belief, permanent personal injuries;

was rendered incapacitated and disabled from attending his usual, customary and daily

occupation and vocation; was caused to undergo the pain of medical care and attention; was

caused to sustain and will in the future sustain a loss of life's enjoyment, and plaintiff, ARTEM

GALYNKIN, was otherwise injured and damaged in the amount to be

determined upon trial of this action.

The amount of damages sought in this action exceeds the jurisdictional limits 15.

of all lower courts that would otherwise have jurisdiction.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff, ARTEM GALYNKIN, demands judgment against

defendants on the First Cause of Action in the amount to be determined upon the trial of this

action, together with the costs and disbursements of this action.

Dated:

Brooklyn, NY

March 18th, 2022

4

FILED: KINGS 2COUNTS 20CLERK me Bt/23/2020 5083/46 Page 13 of 27 PageNDEX: 19. 508494/2022

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 1

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 03/23/2022

Yours, etc.

Irina P. Vaiman, Esq.
Irina P. Vaiman, P.C.,
Attorney for Plaintiff(s)
ARTEM GALYNKIN
1322 Gravesend Neck Road
Brooklyn, NY 11229
(718) 743-6611

VERIFICATION

STATE	OF	NEW YORK)
			١

COUNTY OF KRN65.)

Aldew Calyukin, being duly sworn deposes and says that (s)he is the plaintiff in the above-entitled action; that (s)he has read the contents of the foregoing and knows the contents thereof and that the same is true to his knowledge, except as to matters on information and belief, and as to those matters, (s)he believes it to be true.

Dated: March 18th, 20 22

Sworn to before me this 8th

7 of 8

FILED: KINGS COUNTY 26LERK 123/2023 PMge 15 of 27 Page ID #: 21
NYSCEF DOC. NO. 1

Plaintiff, -against- PEDRO PENA and WALL EXPRESS, INC., Defendant(s)	Filed:
-against- PEDRO PENA and WALL EXPRESS, INC.,	
PEDRO PENA and WALL EXPRESS, INC.,	
Defendant(s)	
SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT	
IRINA VAIMAN, ESQ. Attorney for Plaintiff 1322 Gravesend Neck Road Brooklyn, NY 11229 (718) 743-6611	
To: Attorney(s) for:	•

KINGS: 2CQUMPY2CLUERKIMO 41/1-2/F0 2205/23/04 Page 16 of 27 Page PDE 4: 202. 508494/2022

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 2

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 04/13/2022

Supreme Court of the State of New York County of Kings

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

Index No: 508494/2022

Date Index Number Purchased: 03/23/2022

Plaintiff/Petitioner:

Artem Galvnkin

Defendant/Respondent: Pedro Pena, et al.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

County of Dauphin

ss.:

I, Chad Spotts, depose and say that I am a competent adult authorized to serve this process and that on 03/31/2022 at 12:32 PM, I served the within Summons; Verified Complaint; Verification on Pedro Pena at 2834 Alton Avenue, Allentown, PA 18103 in the manner indicated below:

☑ SUITABLE AGE: by delivering a true copy of each to Maria Pena. Spouse, a person of suitable age and discretion. Said premises is recipient's ☐ actual place of business ☑ dwelling house (usual place of abode) within the state.

MAIL COPY. On 04/04/2022, deponent completed service by depositing a true copy of each document to the above address in a 1st Class postpaid properly addressed envelope not indicating that mailing was from an attorney or concerned legal action and marked "Personal and Confidential" in an official depository under the exclusive care and custody of the United States Post Office.

A description of the recipient, or other person served on behalf of the recipient is as follows:

Sex	Color of skin	Color of hair	Age	Height	Weight
Female	Hispanic	Black	55	5ft 08in	170 lbs
Other Features:					

MIL. SRVC: I asked the person spoken to whether defendant was active in the military service of the United States or the State of New York in any capacity whatsoever and received a negative reply. Upon information and belief I have; being based on the conversations and observations above narrated, defendant is not in the military service.

Sworn to and subscribed before me on 54 April , 20 JL

by an affiant who is personally known to

me or produced identification.

Chad Spotts

PM Legal

1235 Broadway, 2nd Floor

New York, NY 10001

Our File#: 6379952

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania - Notary Seal John F. Shinkowsky, Notary Public Dauphin County My commission expires September 28, 2022

Commission number 1151303



Case 1:22-cv-02820 Document 1-2 Filed 05/13/22 Page 17 of 27 PageID#: 23 508494/2022 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 04/21/2022

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 4

Supreme Court of the State of New York **County of Kings**

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

Index No: 508494/2022

Date Index Number Purchased: 03/23/2022

Plaintiff/Petitioner:

Artem Galynkin

Defendant/Respondent: Pedro Pena, et al.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

County of Dauphin

SS.:

I, Chad Spotts, depose and say that I am a competent adult authorized to serve this process and that on 03/30/2022 at 12:23 PM, I served the within Summons; Verified Complaint; Verification on Wall Express, Inc. at 545 North Centre Street, Pottsville, PA 17901 in the manner indicated below:

CORPORATE SERVICE: By delivering a true copy of each to Ivan Pucar, Dispatcher of the above named corporation. So served and authorized to accept service.

A description of the recipient, or other person served on behalf of the recipient is as follows:

Sex	Color of skin	Color of hair	Age	Height	Weight
Male	White	Black	55	5ft 10in	220 lbs
Other Fo	eatures:				

Sworn to and subscribed before me on 2011

by an affiant who is personally known to

me or produced identification.

Chad Spotts

PM Legal

1235 Broadway, 2nd Floor

New York, NY 10001

Our File#: 6379978

NOTARY PUBLIC

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania - Notary Seal John F. Shinkowsky, Notary Public Dauphin County

My commission expires September 28, 2022 Commission number 1151303



SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF MANY YORK COUNTY OF

- STATEMENT OF AUTHORIZATION FOR
ELECTRONIC FILING
(Managing Attorney Authorizing Individual Filing Agent)
780 100 P16 110 - 100 - 2853100
1, KC7, VOVVCAReq., (Afterney Registration No.) am the
1, The Markey (Attorney Registration No.) am the managing afformey of attorney in charge of e-filing for
represent that the attorneys in the Firm who are authorized users of the NYSCEF system hereby
anthorize INSYNC LITIGATION SUPPORT, LLC ("the filing agent") to utilize his/her
NYSCER filing agent ID to file documents on their behalf and at their direction in any e-filed
matter in which they are counsel of record through NYSCRF, as provided in Section 202.5-b of
the Uniform Rules for the Trial Courts.
and the same of th
This authorization extends to any consensual matter in which these attorneys have previously consented to e-filing or may hereafter consent, to any mandatory matter in which
they have recorded their representation, and to any matter in which they authorize the filling
agent to record consent or representation in the NYSCHF system.
This authorization extends to any and all documents these attorneys generate and
submit to the filing agent for filing in any such matter. This authorization, posted once on the
NYSCEP website as to each matter in which these attorneys are counsel of record, shall be
deemed to accompany any document in that matter filed by the filing agent on behalf of these
attomeys.
This authorization also extends to matters of payment, which the filing agent may make
either by debiting an account the filing agent maintains with the County Clerk of any authorized.
e-filing county or by debiting an account the Firm maintains with the County Clerk of any
authorized e-filing county.
and a second sec
This authorization regarding this filing agent shall continue until the Firm revokes the authorization in writing on a prescribed form delivered to the E-Bling Resource Center.
aumorization in writing on a presumper form denvered to the it-binds resource contra-
1 / 1 / 12 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Dated: /O/O/
1000 Bookher NO 11229
Visignature City, State and Zip Code)
1010 -4 BUDEL (78)-7-13-661/
Print Name Phone
Titte aloren
1 a Sta of Davin in une plante has come:
Lawyicoso Fried Toursew yarden
Firm/Department E-Mail Address
D Valorance
1300 GROWDS RED WELL insync Acce + FED 273
Control of the contro
1) ROLLEVILLE NOTICE
12010, DE COTO JOS

Please send the completed form via email to wefile@insynclitigation.com or by fax to (212) 500-5140. Thank you.

FILED: KENGS 1 GOUNTY CLERK 05/13/2022 02:26 PM INDEX NO. 508494/2022 Page 19 of 27 Page No. 508494/2022 Page 19 of 27 Page No. 508494/2022 Page 19 of 27 Page No. 508494/2022

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF KINGS	Index No. 508494/2022
ARTEM GALYNKIN,	VERIFIED ANSWER
Plaintiff,	
-against-	
PEDRO PENA and WALL EXPRESS, INC.	

Defendants.

Defendants PEDRO PENA and WALL EXPRESS, INC., by their attorneys, TRAUB

LIEBERMAN STRAUS & SHREWSBERRY LLP, for their Verified Answer to the Verified Complaint, state as follows:

- 1. Defendants deny knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in paragraph "I" of the Verified Complaint.
- 2. Defendants admit the allegations set forth in paragraph "2" of the Verified Complaint.
- 3. Defendants deny knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in paragraph "3" of the Verified Complaint.
- 4. Defendants deny the allegations set forth in paragraph "4" of the Verified Complaint and respectfully refer all legal conclusions to the Court.
- 5. Defendants admit the allegations set forth in paragraph "5" of the Verified Complaint.
- 6. Defendants deny the allegations set forth in paragraph "6" of the Verified Complaint and respectfully refer all legal conclusions to the Court.

- 7. Defendants admit the allegations set forth in paragraph "7" of the Verified Complaint.
- 8. Defendants admit the allegations set forth in paragraph "8" of the Verified Complaint.
- 9. Defendants deny knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in paragraph "9" of the Verified Complaint.
- 10. Defendants deny the allegations set forth in paragraph "10" of the Verified Complaint and respectfully refer all legal conclusions to the Court.
- 11. Defendants deny the allegations set forth in paragraph "11" of the Verified Complaint and respectfully refer all legal conclusions to the Court.
- 12. Defendants deny the allegations set forth in paragraph "12" of the Verified Complaint and respectfully refer all legal conclusions to the Court.
- 13. Defendants deny the allegations set forth in paragraph "13" of the Verified Complaint and respectfully refer all legal conclusions to the Court.
- 14. Defendants deny the allegations set forth in paragraph "14" of the Verified Complaint and respectfully refer all legal conclusions to the Court.
- 15. Defendants deny the allegations set forth in paragraph "15" of the Verified Complaint and respectfully refer all legal conclusions to the Court.

FOR A FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

16. Any injuries and/or damages sustained by Plaintiff, as alleged in the Verified Complaint, which Defendants deny, were caused, in whole or in part, by the contributory

negligence and/or culpable conduct of Plaintiff and not because of any negligence and/or culpable conduct on the part of Defendants.

FOR A SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

17. Plaintiff lacks personal jurisdiction over the Defendants, and, as such, this venue is improper.

FOR A THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

18. Plaintiff failed to exercise ordinary care to effect a cure and to prevent aggravation of the alleged injury and damage.

FOR A FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

19. The Verified Complaint fails to state a cause of action upon which relief can be granted.

FOR A FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

20. Pursuant to the provisions of Article 16 of the CPLR, should Defendants be found liable for damages, such liability being 50% or less of the total liability assigned to all persons liable, the liability of Defendants for non-economic loss shall not exceed their equitable share determined in accordance with the relative culpability of all parties liable.

FOR A SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

21. By entering into the activity in which Plaintiff was engaged at the time of the occurrence set forth in the Verified Complaint, Plaintiff knew the inherent risks incident thereto and had full knowledge of the dangers thereof; that whatever injuries and damages were sustained by Plaintiff herein as alleged in the Verified Complaint arise from and were caused by reason of

such risks voluntarily undertaken by Plaintiff in the activities and such risks were assumed and accepted by Plaintiff in performing and engaging in said activities.

FOR A SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

22. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff either failed to use, improperly used or misused available seat belts as a result of which the alleged injuries were sustained or aggravated and by virtue of the foregoing, the damages, if any, to which Plaintiff might otherwise be entitled to recover should be mitigated accordingly.

FOR AN EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

23. If there were any defects or hazardous conditions referred to in the Verified Complaint, which Defendants deny, Plaintiff failed to exercise reasonable care to discover the alleged defects and to appreciate the dangers thereof.

FOR A NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

24. The negligence of a third person or entity over whom Defendants had no control was a superseding cause and insulates Defendants from liability.

FOR A TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

25. The provisions of C.P.L.R. Article 50-B apply to any verdict in this case.

FOR AN ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

26. The dangers, if any, alleged in the Verified Complaint were patent, open and obvious.

FOR A TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

27. Plaintiffs' conduct was the sole proximate cause of the injuries alleged.

FOR A THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

28. Defendants were not served in accordance with the provisions of the CPLR and, accordingly, the Court lacks jurisdiction over the person of Defendants.

FOR A FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

29. This action is barred as against Defendants by virtue of 49 U.S.C. §30106 (the Graves Amendment).

FOR A FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

30. The accident described in the Complaint did not result in a serious injury to Plaintiff as so defined in and by Section § 5102 (d) of the Insurance Law of the State of New York. By reason of the premise aforesaid, and as expressly provided in CPLR § 3016 (g) of the State of New York, Plaintiff had and has no right to institute, maintain or prosecute this action and are barred from so doing.

FOR A SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

31. This lawsuit may not be maintained pursuant to §§ 5102 and 5104 of the New York State Insurance Law based upon Plaintiff's failure to sustained a serious injury within the meaning of the statute.

FOR A SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

32. If Plaintiff sustained a serious injury as so defined in and by Section 5102 (d) of the Insurance Law of the State of New York, such injury was sustained solely as a result of Plaintiff's failure to abide by New York State's Vehicle and Traffic Laws.

FILED: KINGS CUNTY CLERK 05/13/2022 02:26 PM INDEX NO. 508494/2022

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 5

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 5

FOR AN EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

33. In the event Plaintiff recovers a verdict or judgment against Defendants, then such verdict or judgment must be reduced pursuant to CPLR §4545(c) by those amounts which have been or will, with reasonable certainty, replace or indemnify Plaintiff, in whole or in part, for any past or future claimed economic loss, from any collateral source such as insurance, social security, worker's compensation or employee benefit programs.

WHEREFORE, Defendants demand judgment dismissing the Verified Complaint together with costs, disbursements and attorneys' fees of this action and for such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Dated: Hawthorne, New York May 13, 2022

TRAUB LIEBERMAN STRAUS & SHREWSBERRY, LLP

Attorneys for Defendants Pedro Pena and Wall Express, Inc.

By: Lisa M. Rolle

Lisa M. Rolle, Esq. Mid Westchester Executive Park 7 Skyline Drive Hawthorne, New York 10532 (914) 347-2600

TO:

IRINA P. VAIMAN, P.C.

Attorneys for Plaintiff Artem Galynkin 1322 Gravesend Neck Road Brooklyn, New York 11229 (718) 743-6611 FILED: KINGS COUNTY 26 LERK 05/13/2022 02:325 PM ge 25 of 27 Page D #: 31
NYSCEF DOC. NO. 5

ATTORNEY VERIFICATION

STATE OF NEW YORK)	
)	SS.
COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER)	

PEDRO PENA and WALL EXPRESS, INC.. are Defendants in this action.

I am a partner with the firm of Traub Lieberman Straus & Shrewsberry LLP, which has been retained to represent the Defendants in the action herein;

I have read the annexed Verified Answer to Plaintiff's Verified Complaint, know the contents thereof, and the same is true to my knowledge, except to those matters therein which are stated to be alleged upon information and belief, and, as to those matters, I believe them to be true.

My belief, as to those matters therein not stated upon my knowledge, is based upon information contained in our file.

I affirm that the foregoing statements are true under penalties of perjury.

This Verification is made by me and not by the Defendants because the Defendants is located outside the county in which my office is located.

<u> Lisa M. Rolle</u>

Lisa M. Rolle, Esq.
TRAUB LIEBERMAN STRAUS
& SHREWSBERRY LLP
Mid-Westchester Executive Park
Seven Skyline Drive
Hawthorne, New York 10532
914-347-2600

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF KINGS	
ARTEM GALYNKIN,	X Index No. 508494/2022
Plaintiff,	NOTICE OF DEPOSITION
-against-	
PEDRO PENA and WALL EXPRESS, INC.,	
Defendants.	X

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, pursuant to Article 31 of the CPLR, the depositions upon oral examination of ALL PARTIES, in the order of the caption, will be taken at a time, date and location to be mutually agreed upon by the parties in Kings County.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that said parties are to be examined upon all evidence material and necessary in the defense of this action, and are required to produce at the deposition all papers, documents, records, memoranda, correspondence, bills, statements and any other materials relevant to this action which are in their possession, care, custody and control.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that said examinations will continue day-to-day until completed.

FILED: KINGS 1 COUNTY 8 CLEBS 05/13/2022 02:26 PM INDEX NO. 508494/2022 Page 27 of 27 Page 10 step 3 05/13/2022

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 6

Dated: Hawthorne, New York May 13, 2022

TRAUB LIEBERMAN STRAUS & SHREWSBERRY LLP

Attorneys for Defendants Pedro Pena and Wall Express, Inc.

By: Lisa M. Rolle

Lisa M. Rolle Mid-Westchester Executive Park Seven Skyline Drive Hawthorne, New York 10532 (914) 347-2600

TO:

IRINA VAIMAN, P.C.

Attorney for Plaintiff
Artem Galynkin
1322 Gravesend Neck Road
Brooklyn, New York 11229
(718) 743-6611